Remarks

As discussed below, the § 102(b) rejection of claims 1-14 cannot be maintained because the cited portions of the '779 reference do not correspond to the claimed invention. In addition, no valid rejection has been presented for claims 2-14 as the entire rejection presented in the instant Office Action consists of a single paragraph that only addresses claim 1. Moreover, no rejection has been presented for claims 15-19; as such, Applicant submits that claims 15-19 should be identified as allowable. Applicant further notes that the issue date the '779 reference (July 27, 2004) is after Applicant's PCT filing date of March 25, 2004. As such, Applicant requests clarification regarding how the Examiner is asserting that the '779 reference qualifies as prior art § 102(b).

In the non-final Office Action dated October 30, 2008, the following rejection is indicated: claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over the Nielsen reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,768,779). Applicant traverses all of the rejections and, unless explicitly stated by the Applicant, does not acquiesce to any objection, rejection or averment made in the Office Action.

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 102(b) rejection of claims 1-14 because the cited portions of the '779 reference do not correspond to the claimed invention. The claimed invention (in certain embodiments) is directed to correcting timing errors of switches responsive to the difference between a first delay and second delay (*e.g.,* an on delay and an off delay). The first delay representing the timing difference between rising edges of a signal input to the switches and the output response of the switches, and the second delay representing the timing difference between falling edges of the input and output signals. *See, e.g.,* Applicant's Figure 2 and the related discussion in Applicant's specification. The cited portions of the '779 reference, however, do not teach detecting timing differences between rising edges of signal Vr (*i.e.,* the asserted input signal) and signal Vo (*i.e.,* the asserted output signal) or detecting timing differences between falling edges of signal Vr and signal Vo. *See, e.g.,* Figures 8-10 and Col. 6:28 to Col. 7:5. The cited portions of the '779 reference also do not teach correcting switching timing errors of power switch Vp (*i.e.,* the asserted switches) responsive to a difference between a first delay and second delay as in the claimed invention. As such, the cited portions of the

'779 reference do not correspond to the claimed invention. Accordingly, the § 102(b) rejection of claims 1-14 is improper and Applicant requests that it be withdrawn.

Applicant has added new claim 20. Applicant submits that claim 20 is allowable over the '779 reference for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicant notes that support for claim 20 can be found throughout Applicant's disclosure including, for example, in Figures 2-3 and the related discussion in Applicant's specification.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections/objections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, Aaron Waxler, of NXP Corporation at (408) 474-9068.

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Patent Counsel
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131
CUSTOMER NO. 65913

By: _____
Name: Robert J. Crawford
Reg. No.: 32,122
(NXPS.522PA)